

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-6723**

---

JEFFREY ROY CROSBY,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

JOHN LAMBERT; ED SEVERANCE, United States Marshals Service; KEVIN HARVEY, Special Agent, Federal Bureau of Investigation; ADMINISTRATOR OF ORANGEBURG CALHOUN DETENTION CENTER,

Defendants - Appellees.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the District of South Carolina, at Orangeburg. Cameron McGowan Currie, District Judge. (CA-98-277-5-22JI)

---

Submitted: October 21, 1999

Decided: October 27, 1999

---

Before WIDENER and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior Circuit Judge.

---

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Jeffrey Roy Crosby, Appellant Pro Se. Clifford Leon Welsh, North Myrtle Beach, South Carolina; Barbara Murcier Bowens, OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Columbia, South Carolina, for Appellees.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit. See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Jeffrey Roy Crosby appeals from the district court's orders dismissing his Bivens<sup>1</sup> action, and denying his motion for reconsideration filed pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 59(e). Our review of the record discloses that this appeal is without merit. While Crosby contends that the district court improperly resolved factual disputes in granting summary judgment, we find that the district court properly granted summary judgment because Crosby's claims fail as a matter of law. In addition, because Crosby's motion for reconsideration does not demonstrate that his action was improperly dismissed, we find that the district court's denial of his Rule 59(e) motion was not an abuse of discretion.<sup>2</sup> Accordingly, we affirm both district court orders on the reasoning of the district court. See Crosby v. Lambert, No. CA-98-277-5-22JI (D.S.C. Mar. 24 & May 11, 1999). We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the Court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED

---

<sup>1</sup> See Bivens v. Six Unknown Named Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics, 403 U.S. 388 (1971).

<sup>2</sup> See United States v. Williams, 674 F.2d 310, 312 (4th Cir. 1982).